SIMPLY UTILIZE BELLSOUTH'S NETWORK. IT WILL NOT PROVIDE

ANY ECONOMIC GROWTH, IT WILL NOT PROVIDE ANY JOBS, IT WILL

NOT PROVIDE ANY REAL COMPETITION IN SOUTH CAROLINA. THEY

WILL SIMPLY CONTINUE TO USE BELLSOUTH'S NETWORK. AND WHY

IS THAT? THEY WILL DO THAT BECAUSE THE PRICE OF USING

BELLSOUTH'S NETWORK TO THEM WILL BE FAR LESS THAN THE

PRICE OF CONSTRUCTING THEIR OWN FACILITY. SO FIRST AS A

POLICY MATTER, THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS I THINK THAT THIS

COMMISSION SHOULD KEEP IN MIND.

THE SECOND IS THIS: WILL RESALE EVEN BE A VIABLE OR REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE IN ANY TYPE OF AN ARRANGEMENT? ASK YOURSELF: IF YOU COULD BUY SOMETHING FOR A 10 PERCENT DISCOUNT AND THEN TURN AROUND AND BUY THE SAME THING FOR A 75 PERCENT DISCOUNT, WHY WOULD YOU EVER BUY IT FOR A 10 PERCENT DISCOUNT? IT JUST DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE, BUT YET THAT'S WHAT THEY'RE ASKING YOU TO BELIEVE AND BELIEVE THAT SOMEHOW THAT KIND OF ARRANGEMENT ENCOURAGES RESALE COMPETITION. NOW TO ME THAT'S A COMPLETE MYSTERY.

IN LISTENING TO HIS NUMBERS, I CAN'T

READ THE OTHER CHART UP THERE, BUT THERE IS IN FACT A

CHART IN MY TESTIMONY THAT DOES IN FACT INCLUDE RESIDENCE

CUSTOMERS AND THE RELEVANT NUMBERS FOR RESIDENCE CUSTOMERS

ARE THESE. AN AVERAGE RESIDENCE CUSTOMER PAYS ABOUT

\$35.85 RETAIL. THAT INCLUDES THE VERTICAL SERVICES, LONG DISTANCE ACCESS, THE TOTAL VALUE OF WHAT THEY--THE TOTAL PRICE FOR THEIR AVERAGE SERVICE. UNDER A RESALE DISCOUNT OF 10.4 PERCENT FOR RESIDENCE WOULD BE \$33.37. UTILIZING AT&T'S PRICES FOR THE UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS WOULD BE \$21.15. SO WHAT THAT WOULD CREATE IS ALMOST A \$15 SPREAD BETWEEN THE RETAIL PRICE AND THEIR REBUNDLED UNBUNDLED ELEMENT PRICES, AND AGAIN THESE ARE THE PRICES TO AT&T. THESE ARE NOT THE PRICES TO END-USERS.

24

NOW CONTINUING ON WITH ASKING YOURSELF IS THIS PROPER POLICY, WHAT HAPPENS AS A RESULT NOW THAT AT&T IS NOW ABLE TO PURCHASE SERVICES, TO PROVIDE SERVICE TO THAT BUSINESS CUSTOMER OF \$90 FOR \$22? COST THAT BELLSOUTH HAS TO INCUR HASN'T GONE ANYWHERE. REMEMBER, AT&T IS STILL USING BELLSOUTH'S NETWORK. THE SAME FACILITIES ARE STILL BEING USED. ALL OF THE SAME CAPABILITIES ARE STILL BEING USED. THE ONLY THING THAT'S HAPPENED IS THAT WE'RE NO LONGER BILLING THE END-USER, WE'RE BILLING AT&T. IF YOU GO BACK TO MR. GILLAN'S CHART WHERE HE SHOWED THE PROPORTIONS OF CUSTOMERS, THE DISTRIBUTION OF CUSTOMER'S BILLS, AT&T WILL FOCUS ON THOSE CUSTOMERS WHO HAVE HIGH REVENUE. NOW WHAT HAPPENS TO THE CUSTOMERS WHO HAVE LOW REVENUE THAT AT&T DOESN'T WANT? IF BELLSOUTH GIVES AT&T THOSE PRICES FOR THOSE UNBUNDLED

21

22

23

24

ELEMENTS AND ALLOWS THEM TO STRIP OFF THOSE CUSTOMERS WHO ARE HIGH REVENUE/ HIGH CONTRIBUTION CUSTOMERS AND THE COSTS TO BELLSOUTH ARE NOT CONCURRENTLY REDUCED, WHAT HAPPENS TO THE COST OF THE REMAINING CUSTOMERS? IT GOES UP. THAT'S THE ONLY THING THAT CAN HAPPEN. AND WHO ARE THOSE REMAINING CUSTOMERS? THEY'RE NOT THE CUSTOMERS THAT AT&T WANTED; THEY'RE THE CUSTOMERS THAT AT&T DIDN'T WANT AND THOSE CUSTOMERS ARE GOING TO TEND TO BE THE HIGH COST CUSTOMERS WHICH ARE PRINCIPALLY RURAL CUSTOMERS. SO WHAT YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT WHEN YOU EXAMINE THIS AS A POLICY MATTER IS WHAT TYPE OF POLICY DO YOU WANT TO SET IN PLACE. DO YOU WANT TO SET IN PLACE A POLICY THAT ENCOURAGES RESALE AND UNBUNDLED COMPETITION? DO YOU WANT TO SET IN PLACE A POLICY THAT GIVES INCENTIVES TO INVEST AND TO BUILD AND TO GROW IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND EVEN TO SET IN PLACE A POLICY THAT ENSURES THAT RURAL CUSTOMERS STILL CAN ENJOY THE BENEFITS OF TELEPHONE SERVICE AT REASONABLE PRICES AS THEY HAVE IN THE PAST? I WOULD SUBMIT TO YOU THAT AGREEING WITH AT&T'S PROPOSAL WILL NOT GIVE YOU ANY ONE OF THOSE THINGS.

NOW LET ME TURN JUST BRIEFLY TO THE MATTER OF THE LAW. I DISAGREE WHOLEHEARTEDLY WITH THEIR CONCLUSION THAT THE LAW CLEARLY STATES THAT THIS SHOULD BE ALLOWED, BUT AGAIN LET ME BE VERY CLEAR ABOUT THAT. I

	DON'T BELIEVE THAT'S AN ISSUE BEFORE THIS COMMISSION.
	THAT'S AN ISSUE BEFORE THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF
	APPEALS. WE DON'T AGREE THAT THE F.C.C.'S RULES ALLOWING
	THIS RECOMBINATION AGREES WITH THE LAW, AND THOSE JUDGES
	WILL MAKE THAT DECISION. SO I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO MAKE
	THAT DECISION; BUT SINCE IT WAS BROUGHT UP, I WOULD LIKE
	TO SHARE WITH YOU BRIEFLY WHAT OUR VIEWS ARE AND WHY WE
	BELIEVE THE WAY THAT WE BELIEVE REGARDING THAT. THE
	SENTENCE THAT THEY TALK ABOUT IN THE ACTIF I CAN FIND IT
	(EXAMINING DOCUMENT).
A	(MR. GILLAN) IT'S 251(C)(3), LAST SENTENCE.
A	(MR. VARNER) I THOUGHT I HAD PULLED IT OUT. I
	EVIDENTLY PULLED OUT THE WRONG PAGE (EXAMINING DOCUMENT).
A	(MS. WINEGARD) I HAVE IT OUT. DO YOU WANT IT?
A	(MR. VARNER) YEAH, I'D LIKE IT. YOU SHOULD READ IT
	TO ME.
A	(MS. WINEGARD) I WAS ABOUT TO VOLUNTEER.
	(LAUGHTER)
А	(MR. VARNER) BUT WHAT IT SAYS IS THIS. "AN INCUMBENT
	LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER SHALL PROVIDE SUCH UNBUNDLED
	NETWORK ELEMENTS IN A MANNER THAT ALLOWS REQUESTING
	CARRIERS TO COMBINE SUCH ELEMENTS IN ORDER TO PROVIDE SUCH
	TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE." I WANT TO JUST REPEAT ONE
	PART OF IT. THEY NEED TO BE PROVIDED IN A MANNER THAT
	A A A

23

24

ALLOWS REQUESTING CARRIERS TO COMBINE SUCH ELEMENTS IN ORDER TO PROVIDE SUCH TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES. NOW, THERE ARE TWO THINGS ABOUT THAT I THINK ARE MISTAKEN. SOMEHOW THE F.C.C. WAS ABLE TO TAKE THAT PARTICULAR PROVISION AND TURN IT INTO, UPON REQUEST, AN INCUMBENT LEC SHALL PERFORM THE FUNCTIONS NECESSARY TO COMBINE UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS IN ANY MANNER. NOW THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS THIS SAYS THAT THE REQUESTING CARRIER SHALL COMBINE THEM. THE F.C.C. TURNED THAT INTO THE INCUMBENT LEC SHALL COMBINE THEM. THOSE TWO DON'T MEAN THE SAME THING TO ME, AND THAT IS WHAT ATET IS REQUESTING. THEY'RE NOT ASKING TO COMBINE THESE ELEMENTS WITH ANYTHING. THEY'RE ASKING BELLSOUTH TO COMBINE THESE ELEMENTS AND MAKE THEM AVAILABLE TO THEM JUST AS WE WOULD A RESOLD SERVICE. THAT IS CLEARLY NOT WHAT THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF THE ACT SAYS.

IN ADDITION, IF IN FACT CONGRESS HAD
INTENDED THAT THERE BE TWO WAYS OF GETTING THE SAME THING,
WHY WOULD CONGRESS HAVE PUT IN PLACE A MECHANISM THAT SAYS
YOU CAN GET THE 10 PERCENT DISCOUNT FOR SOMETHING OR YOU
CAN GET A 75 PERCENT DISCOUNT FOR THE SAME THING? IT
WOULD NOT MAKE ANY SENSE TO DO THAT. WHAT THEY CLEARLY
INTENDED IS THAT FOR THE RESALE PROVISIONS AND THE
UNBUNDLED ELEMENT PROVISIONS TO APPLY TO TWO DIFFERENT
THINGS, NOT THE SAME THING; AND WHAT AT&T IS TRYING TO

HAVE YOU BELIEVE IS THAT THEY OUGHT TO APPLY TO THE SAME THING. THE ONLY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE TWO IS HOW AT&T REQUESTED IT FROM US. WE WILL PROVIDE THE CUSTOMER WITH THE SAME THING. WE WILL DO THE SAME THING. AT&T CAN DO THE SAME THING WITH THE SERVICE. WE'RE GOING TO PROVIDE THEM WITH A RESOLD 1FR WHEN THEY REQUEST REBUNDLED UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS OR WITH RESOLD 1FB. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO GET FROM US BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THEY'RE ASKING FOR.

SO, AGAIN, THOSE ARE THE TWO POINTS WHY
WE DO NOT BELIEVE THE F.C.C. PROPERLY INTERPRETED THE ACT.
ONE IS THAT THEY'VE TAKEN THE WORDS IN THE ACT AND THEY'VE
SORT OF MISCONSTRUED THEM, AND THE SECOND ONE IS THAT
THEY'VE WRITTEN THE RESALE PROVISIONS OUT OF THE ACT BY
THAT INTERPRETATION THAT THEY MADE. BUT AGAIN, VERY
CLEARLY, THAT'S NOT AN ISSUE THAT WE'RE ASKING YOU TO
DECIDE. THE JUDGES IN ST. LOUIS IN THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT
WILL MAKE THAT DECISION. THE ISSUE BEFORE YOU IS A POLICY
MATTER, IS HOW TO PRICE THESE THINGS.

THE LAST POINT, I JUST WANT TO HIT THIS BRIEFLY. MR. GILLAN MENTIONED THE IDEA THAT THEY ARE NOT GETTING THESE VERTICAL SERVICES FOR FREE. YES, THEY ARE GETTING THEM FOR FREE. THE REASON THEY'RE GETTING THEM FOR FREE IS THIS. THEY'RE GOING TO BUY LOCAL SWITCHING.

Α

THAT'S ALREADY WHAT THEY'RE BUYING. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO PAY ANYTHING IN ADDITION TO THAT FOR THE VERTICAL SERVICES. NOW, IF THAT'S NOT FREE, I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS. WHAT WE'RE SUGGESTING HERE IS THIS. THEY CAN GET THE VERTICAL SERVICES. WE'RE NOT SAYING THAT THEY CAN'T GET THE VERTICAL SERVICES. BUT AS A PRICING MATTER, A VERTICAL SERVICE IS A RETAIL SERVICE. IT SHOULD BE PRICED AS A RETAIL SERVICE, AND IT SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM AT THE WHOLESALE DISCOUNT THAT WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR RETAIL SERVICES. THAT'S REALLY ALL WE'RE SAYING. WE'RE NOT TRYING TO KEEP THEM FROM GETTING THEM. AGAIN, IT'S A MATTER OF WHAT'S THE APPROPRIATE WAY TO PRICE THEM.

(MR. SCHEYE) LET ME JUST ADD, AS YOU WOULD EXPECT, WE'VE BEEN THROUGH THIS ISSUE SEVERAL TIMES IN SEVERAL JURISDICTIONS AND MAYBE IT'S BEEN PUT MOST SUCCINCTLY AND PROBABLY MOST PROPERLY BY THE LOUISIANA COMMISSION MOST RECENTLY WHEN THE COMMISSION BASICALLY SAID, AND I'M TRYING TO QUOTE, "A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME IS STILL A ROSE," AND I THINK THAT'S REALLY WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. THE REAL QUESTION THAT IS BEFORE US: ARE THOSE UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS, WHEN YOU PUT THEM TOGETHER, ANY DIFFERENT THAN A RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS LOCAL EXCHANGE LINE? THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE. THE ANSWER IS THEY'RE ABSOLUTELY NOT. AND

24

HOW DO WE KNOW THAT? HOW DID THE LOUISIANA COMMISSION KNOW THAT? HOW DID THE GEORGIA COMMISSION KNOW THAT AND THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMISSION, TO NAME A FEW? IT'S SIMPLE IN THE SENSE OF GOING THROUGH AND SAYING, WHEN I BUY RESIDENCE AND BUSINESS SERVICE, WHAT DO I GET? I GET THE RIGHT OF DIAL TONE, I GET TO DIAL A CERTAIN GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN A SEVEN-DIGIT BASIS, I GET CERTAIN CALLS ON A LONG DISTANCE BASIS, I GET TO RECEIVE TELEPHONE CALLS, I CAN REACH 911, I CAN MAKE 800 CALLS, AND I COULD GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE LITANY; BUT THAT'S FUNCTIONALLY WHAT LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE PROVIDES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ALSO IN THE STATES OF LOUISIANA, GEORGIA AND NORTH CAROLINA AND FOR THAT MATTER EVERY OTHER STATE IN THE COUNTRY. WHEN I COMBINE THOSE ELEMENTS, CAN I DO ANYTHING DIFFERENT? THE ANSWER IS NO, IT'S THE SAME THING, AND THAT'S WHY THAT COMMISSION DECIDED AND DETERMINED IT'S STILL A ROSE. YOU CAN CALL IT SOMETHING DIFFERENT, YOU CAN ORDER IT DIFFERENTLY, YOU CAN PORTRAY IT ANY WHICH WAY YOU WANT, BUT YOU WILL COME BACK TO ONE SIMPLE ANSWER, IT'S THE IDENTICAL SERVICE. AS MR. VARNER SAID, CONGRESS WOULD NOT HAVE CREATED THE IDENTICAL SERVICE AND HAVE TWO ENTIRELY DIFFERENT PRICING SCHEMES APPLIED TO IT. IT IS JUST NONSENSICAL. SO I THINK, AGAIN, WHILE WE'VE SAID IT IN A LOT OF WORDS AND A LOT OF ARGUMENTS, MAYBE THE MOST

SUCCINCT VERSION OF IT IS WHAT THE LOUISIANA COMMISSION 1 ADOPTED. THANK YOU. 2 DO CHAIRMAN BUTLER: THE 3 COMMISSIONERS HAVE ANY QUESTIONS? COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I DO. 5 CHAIRMAN BUTLER: COMMISSIONER SCOTT. 7 EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT: 8 (COMMISSIONER SCOTT) THIS IS FOR BOTH PANELS. WHAT 0 HAPPENS TO THE EXTENDED AREA SERVICE AGREEMENTS? WHEN 10 AT&T COMES IN AND STARTS PROVIDING LOCAL SERVICE, ARE YOU 11 GOING TO HONOR THE EXTENDED AREA SERVICE AGREEMENTS THAT 12 THIS COMMISSION HAS PREVIOUSLY ORDERED? 13 (MS. WINEGARD) WHY DON'T I START AND MAYBE MR. CARROLL Α 14 WANTS TO ANSWER AS WELL. FIRST OF ALL, I DO HAVE TO 15 CORRECT WHAT MR. SCHEYE REPEATEDLY SAYS ABOUT NORTH 16 CAROLINA. THEY DID SAY THAT WE COULD COMBINE THE NETWORK 17 ELEMENTS IN ANY WAY TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE. THEY'VE ASKED 18 FOR COMMENTS ON THE PRICING OF THOSE ELEMENTS. THEY HAVE 19 NOT REACHED ANY FIRM CONCLUSION ON THAT. BUT THEY DID SAY 20 THAT A PLAIN READING OF THE ACT, REINFORCED BY THE F.C.C. 21 ORDER, LEADS TO THE INESCAPABLE CONCLUSION THAT WE CAN 22 RECOMBINE IN ANY WAY WE WANT. 23 ALL RIGHT, NOW TO THAT SPECIFIC QUESTION

24

23

24

AND THAT IS A VERY GOOD QUESTION. IN A COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT CUSTOMERS WILL WANT AREA CALLING PLANS AND CUSTOMERS THAT WANT AREA CALLING PLANS CAN SUBSCRIBE TO THE AREA CALLING PLANS THAT BELLSOUTH HAS OR ANY OF THE OTHER INCUMBENT CARRIERS HAVE; AND TO BE COMPETITIVE, IF WE PERCEIVE THAT OUR CUSTOMERS WANT AREA CALLING PLANS, YES. WE WILL HAVE THEM. IF WE PERCEIVE THAT WE CAN OFFER A BETTER PLAN OR ANOTHER CALLING AREA THAT CUSTOMERS WANT AND BELLSOUTH DOESN'T OFFER IT, THEN THEY WILL COME TO US. BUT THE COMPETITIVE MARKET WILL DICTATE THE AVAILABILITY OF THOSE PLANS; AND IF SOUTH CAROLINIANS WANT THOSE PLANS, AS A COMPETITOR IN THE MARKET WE WILL PROVIDE THOSE AS A RESULT OF CUSTOMER DEMAND. NOW THE PROBLEM THAT WE HAVE JUST BEEN DISCUSSING WITH RESPECT TO CATEGORICALLY APPLYING THE RESALE DISCOUNT ANY TIME WE PURCHASE BOTH THE LOOP AND THE SWITCH, THEN THAT PREVENTS US FROM CHANGING THE AREA CALLING PLANS IF CUSTOMERS DEMAND ANOTHER AREA TO BE SERVED, ANOTHER LOCAL CALLING AREA, BECAUSE IF WE'RE STUCK WITH THE RESALE, WE'RE STUCK WITH THEIR CALLING AREA AS THEY DEFINE IT, AND WE BELIEVE IT'S MORE APPROPRIATE FOR CONSUMERS TO MAKE THAT CHOICE AND TO TELL US THE AREA THEY WANT SERVED AND WE WILL BE THERE AND WE WILL MEET THAT DEMAND.

DID YOU WANT TO ADD TO THAT?

1	Α	(MR. CARROLL) YES. ONE OF OUR MARKETING VICE
2		PRESIDENTS WAS ASKED A QUESTION ABOUT WHAT IS THE
3		DEFINITION OF LONG DISTANCE. HE RESPONDED, "WELL, WHEN I
4		LOOK OUT MY KITCHEN WINDOW, IF I CAN'T SEE IT, THAT'S LONG
5		DISTANCE." I THINK THAT'S WHAT IT SAYS ABOUT THE LOCAL
6		CALLING AREAS. I THINK IN FACT COMPETITION WILL CAUSE
7		THAT TO BE MORE WIDELY AVAILABLE TO MORE PEOPLE. THE
8		ANSWER IS YES, WE WILL HONOR THE EXTENDED AREA SERVICE
9		AGREEMENTS, DEPENDING ON THE OUTCOME OF THIS COMMISSION IN
10		TERMS OF YOUR RULING. IF YOUR RULING IS AS BELLSOUTH
11		REQUESTS AND ONLY RESALE IS AVAILABLE, YOU'RE ONLY GOING
12		TO SEE COMPETITION DEVELOP IN DENSE AREAS, MAINLY IN THE
13		BUSINESS COMMUNITY, MAINLY IN THE LARGE CITIES. IF YOU
14		RULE AS WE RECOMMEND IN THE POLICY AREAS, THEN YOU WILL
15		SEE THE COMPETITION DEVELOP THAT WILL ENABLE THOSE LOCAL
16		CALLING AREAS TO BE EXPANDED. IN FACT, THE DEFINITION
17		THAT WE REACHED AGREEMENT ON WITH BELLSOUTH IN TERMS OF
18		LOCAL SERVING AREAS GIVE US THAT COMPETITIVE FLEXIBILITY.
19		THAT WAS THE ITEM THAT'S PART OF 24 THAT WAS MENTIONED
20		EARLIER IN TERMS OF REACHING SETTLEMENT ON IT.
21	Q	(COMMISSIONER SCOTT) GO AHEAD.
22	Α	(MR. GILLAN) ACTUALLY MY COMMENT WENT TO SOMETHING
23		THAT MR. VARNER SAID AND I DON'T WANT TO CUT OFF YOUR
24		QUESTIONS. IF I COULD JUST HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER
	1	

AT THE END, THAT WOULD BE FINE.

Q (COMMISSIONER SCOTT) OKAY, FINE. BUT YOU MENTIONED
COMPETITION DRIVING IT, BUT COMPETITION WON'T DRIVE THE
E.A.S.'S BECAUSE WHAT THIS COMMISSION HAS HAD IS A
SITUATION WHERE A SMALL COMMUNITY WANTS THE ABILITY TO
CALL A LARGE COMMUNITY AND WANTS THE ABILITY FOR THAT
LARGE COMMUNITY TO CALL THEM BECAUSE THE LARGE COMMUNITY
DOESN'T REALLY CARE THAT MUCH ABOUT CALLING THEM. WE'VE
HAD TO ORDER EXTENDED AREA SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS BECAUSE OF
THE WISHES OF THIS COMMUNITY WHEREAS THESE PEOPLE WOULD
HAVE VOTED IT DOWN, SO THE COMPETITION HERE WOULDN'T
CREATE THE VOLUNTARY NEED FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE. DO
YOU SEE WHAT I'M SAYING?

(MR. GILLAN)

YEAH, BUT THE WAY YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT
THE PROBLEM IS YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT IT IN THE CONTEXT
THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE ONE COMPANY AND IT'S GOING TO
HAVE ONE CALLING PLAN AND IT'S GOING TO FIT ALL CUSTOMERS
AND, THEREFORE, YOU HAVE TO HAVE SOME SORT OF DEMOCRATIC
ELECTION OF THE SERVICE THAT THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE
SUBSCRIBES TO. THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE FUTURE IS, IF
CARRIERS CAN BUY ALL THESE NETWORK ELEMENTS AND COMPLETE
TRAFFIC AND DESIGN THEIR OWN LOCAL CALLING AREAS, YOU WILL
FIND CARRIERS TRYING TO FIND SUBSCRIBERS. THE WHOLE POINT
OF THIS NEW GAME IS YOU'VE GOT TO WIN THE SUBSCRIBER.

THAT'S GOOD FROM THE COMMISSION'S POINT OF VIEW BECAUSE IT 1 MEANS THERE'S GOING TO BE A BUNCH OF PEOPLE OUT THERE 2 TRYING TO GET THESE CUSTOMERS TO COME OVER TO THEIR LOCAL 3 SERVICES, THEIR LONG DISTANCE SERVICES, THEIR PACKAGE OF SERVICES. IN THAT PROCESS, YOU DON'T NEED TO HAVE A 5 COMMUNITY ELECT IT. ALL YOU NEED TO HAVE IS THAT IF A 6 CARRIER CAN COME IN AND COMPLETE A CALL AND PAY THE COST 7 OF COMPLETING A CALL. WHETHER IT'S "LONG DISTANCE OR 8 LOCAL", THEN THEY WILL DESIGN WHATEVER CUSTOMERS WANT TO 9 BUY IN AN EFFORT TO ATTRACT THEM. ONE COMPANY COULD HAVE 10 A DIFFERENT ONE. YOU'D HAVE FRIENDS AND FAMILIES BETWEEN 11 THESE THINGS, IF YOU WILL. 12 Q (COMMISSIONER SCOTT) BUT RURAL AREAS ARE GOING TO END UP 13 LOSING IT BECAUSE, FOR EXAMPLE, ORANGEBURG TO BRANCHVILLE. 14 PEOPLE IN ORANGEBURG WOULD PROBABLY NOT SELECT A PHONE 15 COMPANY TO CALL BRANCHVILLE, BUT PEOPLE IN BRANCHVILLE 16 WOULD LIKE ORANGEBURG TO BE ABLE TO CALL THEM AND THIS 17 COMMISSION HAS ORDERED THAT, REGARDLESS. 18 Α (MS. WINEGARD) AND THAT IS WHY YOU --19 Α (MR. CARROLL) COMMISSIONER, I SAID WE WOULD HONOR THE 20 REQUIREMENTS. IF YOU MISSED THAT, I APOLOGIZE. I WASN'T 21

CLEAR.

22

23

24

Q (COMMISSIONER SCOTT) OKAY, SO YOU ARE GOING TO HONOR THEM.

1	A	(MR. CARROLL) HOWEVER, IF THERE'S ONLY RESALE
2		AVAILABLE, YOU WILL NOT SEE US HERE IN AN EFFECTIVE WAY,
3		AS BELLSOUTH HAS OUTLINED. SO THE OUTCOME OF YOUR RULINGS
4		ARE GOING TO DEPEND, I THINK, IN TERMS OF HOW ROBUST
5		COMPETITION IS DEVELOPED; BUT RELATIVE TO ENTERING, WE
6		WILL HONOR YOUR REQUIREMENTS.
7	Q	(COMMISSIONER SCOTT) OKAY. SO REGARDLESS OF ALL THE
8		DISCUSSION ABOUT COMPETITION, WHATEVER THE LOCAL AREA IS,
9		YOU WILL HONOR THAT LOCAL AREA.
10		COMMISSIONER SCOTT: OKAY, THANK
11		YOU.
12	Q	(MS. TAYLOR) DO YOU WANT BELLSOUTH TO RESPOND?
13		COMMISSIONER SCOTT: IF THEY HAVE A
14		RESPONSE, THAT'S FINE.
15	A	(MR. VARNER) JUST BRIEFLY. YOUR CONCERN IS REALLY A
16		LEGITIMATE ONE; AND AS YOU'RE HEARING, UNLIKE MAYBE SOME
17		FOLKS OVER ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE TABLE, I THINK THAT
18		YOU'VE HIT ON A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT POINT AND THAT IS
19		YOUR ABILITY TO BE ABLE TO DO THINGS FOR THE GOOD OF THE
20		PUBLIC
21	Q	(COMMISSIONER SCOTT) RIGHT.
22	A	(MR. VARNER) AS OPPOSED TO BEING ABLE TO DO THINGS
	1	FOR PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS, TO BO WHATES IN THEIR OWN BEST
23		FOR PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS, TO DO WHAT'S IN THEIR OWN BEST

1		WITHOUT A DOUBT, FOR PRIVATE INTERESTS IS IN FACT PROBABLY
2		THE BEST WAY TO DO IT; BUT YOU'VE MADE DECISIONS THAT YOU
3		FELT WERE FOR THE GOOD OF THE PUBLIC, FOR THE PUBLIC AS A
4		WHOLE, AND YOUR ABILITY TO CONTINUE TO DO THAT IS GOING TO
5		BE SEVERELY DAMAGED IF IN FACT THEY ARE ALLOWED TO BE ABLE
6		TO GO IN AND CHERRY PICK THIS COMPETITION IN THE WAY THAT
7		THEY'VE INDICATED THAT THEY WANT TO DO IT.
8	Α	(MR. CARROLL) MR. COMMISSIONER, BELLSOUTH HAS 1.2
9		MILLION LINES, THE REST OF THE WORLD HAS ZERO. I HARDLY
10		BELIEVE THE SKY IS FALLING. WHAT WE'RE ASKING FOR HERE IS
11		OPEN, ROBUST COMPETITION AND WE BELIEVE THAT WILL BE GOOD
12		FOR THE CONSUMERS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
13		AND THAT'S OUR BASIC BELIEF. WE THINK THERE ARE MANY
14		MECHANISMS THAT WILL CONTINUE TO SEARCH FOR WAYS TO SOLVE
15		THE PROBLEMS. THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND HAS BEEN
16		MENTIONED AS ONE WAY TO SERVE CERTAIN CONSUMERS DIFFERENT
17		IN THE FUTURE THAN THEY HAVE IN THE PAST, BUT WE BELIEVE
18		THAT COMPETITION WILL BE GOOD FOR THE CONSUMERS THROUGHOUT
19		SOUTH CAROLINA AND LOOK FORWARD TO IT.
20		VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: I'VE GOT A
21		QUESTION.
22		EXAMINATION BY VICE CHAIRMAN
23		BRADLEY:
24	Q	(VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY) I'LL DIRECT THIS TO AT&T AND

PERHAPS TO YOU, MR. CARROLL. HAS AT&T DONE ANY COST ESTIMATES ON IF THEY WERE GOING TO BUILD THEIR OWN FACILITIES-BASED OPERATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA--SWITCHES, ACCESS LINES, ET CETERA, WHAT THE COST WOULD BE? I THINK MS. WINEGARD SAID MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, BUT WHAT ARE WE SPECIFICALLY TALKING ABOUT?

22

23

24

(MR. CARROLL) NO, WE HAVEN'T IN THAT REGARD. WHEN I THINK SHE SAID MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, SHE WAS REPRESENTING TO THE INSTALLED BASE OF ASSETS AND CUSTOMERS THAT ARE HERE. I THINK WHAT YOU'LL SEE HAPPEN IS THAT THE MARKET WILL EVOLVE AS JOSEPH GILLAN AND DR. KASERMAN TALKED ABOUT. I THINK WITH THE KIND OF TOOLS THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE THAT ARE ENVISIONED IN THE ACT, YOU'LL SEE COMPETITION DEVELOP FIRST AT THE RETAIL LEVEL AND THEN I THINK YOU'LL SEE COMPETITION DEVELOP AT THE WHOLESALE LEVEL. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? INSTEAD OF SEEING A PRICE FOR AN INDIVIDUAL SWITCH HOOK OF, SAY \$1.29, YOU'LL START TO SEE A HUNDRED SWITCH HOOKS FOR SALE AT SEVENTY BUCKS; AND AS THAT HAPPENS, YOU'LL SEE FACILITIES INVESTED IN AND DEVELOPED. INITIALLY, CERTAINLY SWITCHES WOULD BE PUT IN IN THAT STAGE AND THEN I THINK THERE'S SOME QUESTION AROUND THE LOCAL LOOP IN TERMS OF HOW MUCH OF THAT IS A NATURAL MONOPOLY AND HOW FAR DOWN THE FOOD CHAIN THAT WOULD BE DEVELOPED. SO THAT'S WHERE WE ARE IN THIS STATE.

1		WE'VE DONE SOME PLANNING, BUT IN THE END I THINK IT'S
2		GOING TO DEPEND ON WHAT THE CONDITIONS OF ENTRY ARE AND
3		HOW SUCCESSFUL WE ARE AT THE RETAIL LEVEL BEFORE WE MOVE
4		INTO THE FACILITIES BASED AND THE WHOLESALE LEVEL.
5	Q	(VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY) I THINK THAT IT HAS BEEN SAID
6		HERE IN THE LAST DAY OR SO THAT ATET WOULD LIKE TO, LET'S
7		SAY, HAVE 35 PERCENT OF THE MARKET. I THINK MAYBE 30
8		PERCENT WAS THROWN OUT. IF YOU HAD 30 PERCENT OF THE
9		MARKET, WOULD YOU HAVE YOUR OWN FACILITIES?
10	A	(MR. CARROLL) YES, I BELIEVE SO; BUT 30 PERCENT OF THE
11		MARKET WAS A NUMBER THAT WAS ATTRIBUTED TO EITHER THE
12		ATTORNEY IN THE OPENING STATEMENT OR MR. VARNER MAYBE.
13		THAT WAS A GOAL THAT BOB ALLEN HAD ARTICULATED FOR A
14		NATIONAL KIND OF ATTAINMENT. IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT WE
15		WOULD DO THAT IN EVERY MARKET OR BE THAT SUCCESSFUL IN
16		EVERY MARKET.
17	Q	(VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY) BUT IF YOU WERE THAT SUCCESSFUL
18		IN SOUTH CAROLINA, YOU'D HAVE YOUR OWN FACILITIES?
19	A	(MR. CARROLL) YES.
20		VICE CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: NO FURTHER
21		QUESTIONS.
22	Q	(MS. TAYLOR) HAVE WE MISSED ANY REPLIES?
23	A	(MR. GILLAN) I'D LIKE TO MAKE A VERY, VERY SHORT
24		REPLY TO MR. VARNER'S CRITICISMS BECAUSE IT ACTUALLY

22

23

24

DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING OR VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH NETWORK COMBINATIONS. HIS CRITICISM WAS THAT IF YOU LET THEM DO THIS, THEY WON'T BUILD. WELL, I THINK THE ANSWER THAT MR. CARROLL GAVE, AT&T WILL BUILD. LET'S FACE IT, THERE'S NOBODY THAT'S GOING TO COMPETE AGAINST BELLSOUTH THAT WANTS TO RELY ON THEM ENTIRELY. EVERYBODY HAS AN INCENTIVE TO BUILD. THE FACTOR THAT WILL DECIDE WHETHER YOU BUILD AND WHAT YOU BUILD HAS TO DO WITH THE PRICE OF THE NETWORK ELEMENTS. WHERE BELLSOUTH'S NETWORK IS THE MOST EFFICIENT AND THE BEST CHOICE, CARRIERS WON'T BUILD TO REPLICATE IT. THAT'S GOOD FOR CONSUMERS. THAT'S WHAT THE ACT CALLS FOR AND, QUITE FRANKLY, WALL STREET WOULDN'T HAVE IT ANY OTHER WAY. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO LEND MONEY TO PEOPLE TO GO BUILD NETWORKS THAT ARE MORE COSTLY THAN BELLSOUTH'S. BUT THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE ABILITY OF FINDING PLACES YOU CAN DO IT BETTER THAN BELLSOUTH AND BRING THOSE BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS. IT DOES NOT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH COMBINING ELEMENTS.

THEN JUST A SECOND POINT. HE INDICATED

THAT THE VERTICAL FEATURES ARE FREE. USING HIS LOGIC, I

JUST BOUGHT A CAR THAT I'M GLAD TO FIND OUT THAT THE RADIO

WAS FREE, THE TIRES WERE FREE, THE SEATS WERE FREE, THE

ENGINE WAS FREE. UNFORTUNATELY, THE TOTAL PRICE OF THE

CAR SEEMS TO BE VERY HIGH TO ME NOW. IT'S THE SAME THING

Q

Α

HERE. NOTHING IS FREE HERE. AT&T PAYS FULLY FOR THOSE CAPABILITIES BECAUSE THOSE CAPABILITIES ARE BUILT INTO THE SWITCH AND THEY PAY FOR THEM.

THAT WAS MY ONLY COMMENT. THANK YOU.

(MS. TAYLOR) LET'S MAKE ISSUES 16 AND 19 VERY BRIEF, IF WE CAN. SIXTEEN CONCERNS BELLSOUTH MAKING RIGHTS-OF-WAY AVAILABLE TO AT&T ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS EQUAL TO THAT IT PROVIDES ITSELF. AS WE DID WITH THE LAST ELEMENTS, 24 THROUGH 29, I WOULD ASK THAT EACH PANEL MAKE A BRIEF SUMMARY STATEMENT AND WE'LL BEGIN WITH BELLSOUTH.

(MR. SCHEYE) LET ME DEAL WITH ISSUE 16, THAT'S RIGHT-OF WAYS. IN ESSENCE, OUR PROPOSAL IS FAIRLY STRAIGHT-FORWARD. WE HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS, HAVE FOR YEARS, WITH LOTS OF OTHER CARRIERS. WE ARE APPLYING THE SAME PRINCIPLES PRECISELY TO THOSE CARRIERS. WE WOULD LIKE AT&T TO DO THAT AS WELL. THEY HAVE ASKED FOR CERTAIN SPECIFIC THINGS THAT WERE RAISED HERE IN SOUTH CAROLINA THAT DID NOT COME UP IN OTHER PROCEEDINGS. ONE OF THOSE HAS TO DO WITH ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION BEING PROVIDED TO THEM. BASICALLY BELLSOUTH IS--IT'S AN IMPRACTICAL CAPABILITY OF OURS BECAUSE WE DON'T FULLY OWN ALL OF OUR DUCTS. SOMETIMES THEY'RE OWNED BY OTHER PARTIES, ET CETERA. SOMETIMES THOSE ENVIRONMENTAL TESTS

ARE PERFORMED WITHOUT OUR KNOWLEDGE, SO WE WOULDN'T EVEN

KNOW TO BE ABLE TO TELL THEM. SO IT'S NOT A MATTER OF INTENT OR POLICY OR ANYTHING ELSE, BUT THERE'S A PRACTICAL PROBLEM WITH THAT.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THEY'VE ALSO ASKED FOR STORAGE SPACE FOR CERTAIN KINDS OF EQUIPMENT IN OUR DUCTS, AND AGAIN I THINK THIS IS NOT A POLICY ISSUE, IT'S A PRACTICAL ISSUE. THERE'S LOTS OF CARRIERS WHO WILL WANT TO USE OUR DUCTS AND ALREADY DO. WE HAVE TO SOMEHOW LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF EQUIPMENT BECAUSE THERE'S A FINITE AMOUNT OF SPACE IN THOSE DUCTS. WE CAN'T LET PEOPLE JUST LEAVE ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING IN THERE. WE HAVE MADE A PROPOSAL TO AT&T WHICH WE THINK WE CAN LIVE WITH WHICH ALLOW THEM TO LEAVE CERTAIN EQUIPMENT IN THERE FOR SHORT PERIODS OF TIME. WE BELIEVE WE CAN MAKE THAT APPLICABLE TO OTHER CARRIERS AS WELL, BUT AGAIN WE CANNOT SIMPLY SAY YOU LEAVE WHATEVER YOU WANT IN OUR DUCTS BECAUSE YOU'RE DEALING WITH FINITE SPACE AND YOU'RE DEALING WITH A POTENTIALLY LARGE NUMBER OF CARRIERS. I GUESS THE BOTTOM LINE OF OUR PROPOSAL IS, WE HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH DUCTS IN RIGHT-OF-WAY. WE'VE BEEN DOING IT FOR YEARS. WE THINK IT OUGHT TO BE APPLIED IN A COMPARABLE MANNER TO AT&T, JUST LIKE ALL OTHER PARTIES AND ALL OTHER CARRIERS, AND THAT'S BASICALLY WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING.

A (MR. HAMMAN) IF I CAN RESPOND FROM AT&T'S

24

PERSPECTIVE, WHAT THE ACT CALLS FOR IS NONDISCRIMINATORY, EQUAL BASIS PROVISIONING OF THE ACT IS WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE ON RIGHT-OF-WAYS. WE'RE ASKING FOR THE SAME THING THAT BELLSOUTH PROVIDES TO THEMSELVES: ACCESS TO PROVIDE THE EQUIPMENT WHEN YOU'RE DOING SOME CONSTRUCTION FOR UP TO 48 HOURS, ACCESS TO A COMMON DUCT THAT THEY HAVE IN THEIR EMERGENCY RESTORATION PROCEDURE. WE'RE ASKING FOR THE SAME ACCESS FOR US AND OTHER CARRIERS THAT WOULD HELP US IN THE CASE OF A RESTORATION, AND ACCESS WHERE THEY HAVE IT AVAILABLE TO THAT INFORMATION ON WHERE THERE'S HAZARDOUS CONTAMINANTS IN THE DUCTS THAT THEY OWN. SO AS MR. SCHEYE HAS SAID, HE WANTS TO LIMIT AT&T. HE WANTS TO PUT US IN THE SAME WITH OTHER CARRIERS, BUT NOT IN THE SAME BOAT WITH BELLSOUTH AND IT DOESN'T SEEM TO ME THAT'S WHAT THE ACT CALLS FOR. BELLSOUTH HAS THESE PROCEDURES IN PLACE FOR THEMSELVES. THEY, I'M SURE, DON'T RESTRICT THEIR INSTALLATION CREW FROM LEAVING THEIR EQUIPMENT AND WE'RE ONLY ASKING FOR UP TO 50 FEET OF CABLE AND SOME OTHER EQUIPMENT DURING A 48 HOUR PERIOD OF TIME. THESE ARE NOT UNRESOLVABLE ISSUES. THEY'RE NOT POLICY ISSUES. BUT WHAT IS THE POLICY ISSUE THAT MR. SCHEYE AND BELLSOUTH CONTINUALLY BRINGS UP TO US AND IT SEEMS VERY SUBTLE IS THAT THEY WANT TO LIMIT US AND PUT US IN A BOAT WITH OTHER CARRIERS AND NOT IN THE SAME BOAT WITH

24

Α

THEMSELVES, AND THE ACT CALLS FOR US TO BE ON AN EQUAL, NONDISCRIMINATORY BASIS WITH THEMSELVES AND IT WOULD HELP US GET INTO THE MARKET.

Q (MS. TAYLOR) ISSUE 19, REGARDING DARK FIBER, DO THE
PARTIES WISH TO MAKE A SUMMARY STATEMENT ON THAT ISSUE?

PARTIES WISH TO MAKE A SUMMARY STATEMENT ON THAT ISSUE? (MR. VARNER) I'LL MAKE A BRIEF STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO THAT ISSUE. THE ISSUE AROUND DARK FIBER IS VERY SIMPLY THIS. DARK FIBER IS NOT A NETWORK ELEMENT; THEREFORE, IT CANNOT BE UNBUNDLED. IF YOU LOOK AT THE DEFINITION OF A NETWORK ELEMENT THAT THE F.C.C. HAS WRITTEN. IT SAYS THE NETWORK ELEMENT IS "A FACILITY OR EQUIPMENT USED IN THE PROVISION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE." WHAT DARK FIBER IS IS FIBER THAT IS IN THE NETWORK THAT IS NO LONGER IN USE. IT IS SITTING THERE. MAYBE IT WAS IN USE AT SOME POINT IN TIME; BUT, FOR WHATEVER REASON, IT DOESN'T SERVE ANY PURPOSE AND IT'S NOT BEING USED IN THE NETWORK. IF YOU'RE LIKE ME, IT'S SORT OF AKIN TO THINGS THAT YOU BOUGHT THAT YOU USED AT ONE TIME AND END UP GETTING STORED IN THE BACK OF A CLOSET SOMEWHERE WITH THE THOUGHT THAT MAYBE SOMEDAY, YOU KNOW, I'LL HAVE A USE FOR THAT THING, AND THAT'S WHAT THIS IS AKIN TO. IT'S NOT USED FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE; CONSEQUENTLY, IT CAN'T BE TREATED AS AN UNBUNDLED ELEMENT. THEREFORE, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT WE MAKE IT AVAILABLE.

24

Α

(MR. HAMMAN) AT&T ASKED FOR DARK FIBER, NOT AS ONE OF THE TWELVE ELEMENTS UP THERE, BUT WE ASKED FOR IT AS AN ANCILLARY FUNCTION OF THE NETWORK. THEN IT IS USED IN THE TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES AS BELLSOUTH. AS I DEMON-STRATED IN THE CD-ROM PRESENTATION. IT'S PART OF THE COMMON AND DEDICATED TRANSPORT. TYPICALLY TODAY MOST TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES THAT COMPANIES PUT IN PLACE FOR THE TRANSPORT ELEMENTS -- FIBER OPTIC, HIGH CAPACITY FIBER OPTIC FACILITIES. IN MANY CASES THESE FIBER OPTIC FACILITIES CONTAIN UP TO 96 STRANDS OF FIBER. IN MANY CASES, NOT ALL OF THOSE STRANDS ARE USED IN--CURRENTLY BEING USED BY BELLSOUTH, BUT THEY ARE DEPLOYED IN THE NETWORK. THEY'RE AVAILABLE FOR OUR USE. BELLSOUTH'S NOT USING THEM, SO OUR BELIEF IS WE'D BE WILLING TO PAY FOR THEM UNDER THE PRICING COST STRUCTURE THAT THE F.C.C. HAS PROVIDED US. THEY'RE AVAILABLE FOR OUR USE AND THEY SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO US. BELLSOUTH IS USING THESE FACILITIES FOR THEIR OWN TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES. THEY'RE NO DIFFERENT. THEY'RE IDENTICAL TO THE SAME FACILITIES THAT THEY USE, THESE STRANDS ARE. THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS, ON DARK FIBER THE ELECTRONICS IS NOT ON THE END OF THE FIBER. THEY'RE JUST A PIECE OF GLASS SITTING THERE WAITING FOR THE ELECTRONICS TO BE PUT ON. **S**0 THEY'RE IDENTICAL TO WHAT BELLSOUTH IS USING TODAY,

THEY'RE AVAILABLE, AND WE BELIEVE AT&T SHOULD HAVE ACCESS
TO THOSE.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

Q

(MS. TAYLOR) LET'S MOVE QUICKLY TO THE FIRST ISSUES
THAT ARE LISTED IN THE MATRIX REGARDING LOCAL SERVICES
RESALE. THE FIRST ISSUE, I BELIEVE, IS STATED AS WHAT
SERVICES PROVIDED BY BELLSOUTH, IF ANY, SHOULD BE EXCLUDED
FROM RESALE AND I'M INTERESTED IN THE PARTIES TALKING
ABOUT WHO HAS THE BURDEN OF PROOF THAT SERVICES SHOULD BE
EXEMPTED AND WHEN AND WHY, IF BELLSOUTH WOULD LIKE TO
START BY ADDRESSING THAT QUESTION.

24

LIFELINE/LINKUP SUBSIDY PROGRAMS. THEY ARE TECHNICALLY AVAILABLE THROUGH MESSAGE RATE LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE. WE'RE SAYING IF AT&T WANTS TO PROVIDE THEM, THEY CAN PROVIDE MESSAGE RATE LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE AND THEY, LIKE US. CAN ABSORB THE SUBSIDY OR THE LOSS. SO WE'RE SAYING THEY CAN RESELL THE SERVICE, THEY CAN PROVIDE IT TO THE IDENTICAL CUSTOMERS WE CAN; HOWEVER, TO THE EXTENT WE ABSORB A SUBSIDY, THEY SHOULD ABSORB THE SAME SUBSIDY IN PROVIDING THAT SERVICE. THOSE ARE THE TYPE OF LIMITATIONS THAT WE'RE PUTTING ON. FURTHER, PROMOTIONAL SERVICES FOR LESS THAN 90 DAYS SHOULD NOT BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR RESALE. AGAIN. THERE'S A RETAIL SERVICE THERE THAT ONE CAN RESELL AT A DISCOUNT. WE'RE NOT SAYING THEY CAN'T. THE PROMOTION IS SOMETHING WE WOULD TYPICALLY LOSE MONEY ON; FOR EXAMPLE, WAIVE A NONRECURRING CHARGE. IF AT&T WANTS TO PROVIDE THE SAME SERVICE AND WAIVE THE NONRECURRING, THEY CAN, TOO, AND THEY CAN ABSORB THAT EXPENSE LOSS JUST LIKE WE CAN FOR THE SAKE OF MARKETING OR COMPETITION, ET CETERA. SO IN NO CASE ARE WE SAYING THE SERVICE WON'T BE AVAILABLE FOR RESALE; WE'RE SAYING THE BASIC, UNIQUE PRICING ARRANGEMENTS THAT ARE APPLICABLE TO THESE TYPES OF SITUATIONS SHOULD BE--MAKE THOSE PRICES NOT AVAILABLE FOR RESALE, BUT WE'RE NOT RESTRICTING ANY SERVICE BEING MADE AVAILABLE FOR RESALE.